

(2) Each MRS is assigned to one of eight MRS priorities based on the ratings of the three hazard evaluation modules, where Priority 1 indicates the highest potential hazard and Priority 8 the lowest potential hazard. Under the rule in this part, only MRSs with CWM can be assigned to Priority 1 and no MRS with CWM can be assigned to Priority 8. (See appendix A to this part, table 25.)

(3) An “evaluation pending” rating is used to indicate that an MRS requires further evaluation. This designation is only used when none of the three modules has a numerical rating (*i.e.*, 1 through 8) and at least one module is rated “evaluation pending.” The Department shall develop program metrics focused on reducing the number of MRSs with a status of “evaluating pending” for any of the three modules. (See appendix A, table 25.)

(4) A “no longer required” rating is used to indicate that an MRS no longer requires prioritization. The MRS will receive this rating when none of the three modules has a numerical (*i.e.*, 1 through 8) or an “evaluation pending” designation, and at least one of the modules is rated “no longer required.”

(5) A rating of “no known or suspected hazard” is used to indicate that an MRS has no known or expected hazard. This designation is used only when the hazard evaluation modules are rated as “no known or suspected explosive hazard,” “no known or suspected CWM hazard,” and “no known or suspected MC hazard.” (See appendix A, table 25.)

§ 179.7 Sequencing.

(a) *Sequencing considerations.* The sequencing of MRSs for action shall be based primarily on the MRS priority determined through applying the rule in this part. Generally, an MRS that presents a greater relative risk to human health, safety, or the environment will be addressed before an MRS that presents a lesser relative risk. Other factors, however, may warrant consideration when determining the sequencing for specific MRSs. In evaluating other factors in sequencing decisions, the Department will consider a broad range of issues. These other, or risk-plus factors, do not influence or

change the MRS priority, but may influence the sequencing for action. Examples of factors that the Department may consider are:

(1) Concerns expressed by regulators or stakeholders.

(2) Cultural and social factors.

(3) Economic factors, including economic considerations pertaining to environmental justice issues, economies of scale, evaluation of total life cycle costs, and estimated valuations of long-term liabilities.

(4) Findings of health, safety, or ecological risk assessments or evaluations based on MRS-specific data.

(5) Reasonably anticipated future land use, especially when planning response actions, conducting evaluations of response alternatives, or establishing specific response action objectives.

(6) A community’s reuse requirements at Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations.

(7) Specialized considerations of tribal trust lands (held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any tribe or individual). The United States holds the legal title to the land and the tribe holds the beneficial interest.

(8) Implementation and execution considerations (*e.g.*, funding availability; the availability of the necessary equipment and people to implement a particular action; examination of alternatives to responses that entail significant capital investments, a lengthy period of operation, or costly maintenance; alternatives to removal or treatment of contamination when existing technology cannot achieve established standards [*e.g.*, maximum contaminant levels]).

(9) Mission-driven requirements.

(10) The availability of appropriate technology (*e.g.*, technology to detect, discriminate, recover, and destroy UXO).

(11) Implementing standing commitments, including those in formal agreements with regulatory agencies, requirements for continuation of remedial action operations until response objectives are met, other long-term management activities, and program administration.

(12) Established program goals and initiatives.

Pt. 179, App. A

32 CFR Ch. I (7–1–15 Edition)

(13) Short-term and long-term ecological effects and environmental impacts in general, including injuries to natural resources.

(b) *Procedures and documentation for sequencing decisions.* (1) Each installation or FUDS is required to develop and maintain a Management Action Plan (MAP) or its equivalent. Sequencing decisions, which will be documented in the MAP at military installations and FUDS, shall be developed with input from appropriate regulators and stakeholders (*e.g.*, community members of an installation's restoration advisory board or technical review committee). If the sequencing of an MRS is changed from the sequencing reflected in the current MAP, information documenting the reasons for the sequencing change will be provided for inclusion in the MAP. Notice of the change in the sequencing shall be provided to those regulators and stakeholders that provided input to the sequencing process.

(2) In addition to the information on prioritization, the Components shall ensure that information provided by regulators and stakeholders that may influence the sequencing of an MRS is included in the Administrative Record and the Information Repository.

(3) Components shall report the results of sequencing to ODUSD(I&E) (or successor organizations). ODUSD(I&E) shall compile the sequencing results reported by each Component and publish the sequencing in the report on environmental restoration activities for that fiscal year. If sequencing decisions result in action at an MRS with a lower MRS priority ahead of an MRS with a higher priority, specific justification shall be provided to the ODUSD(I&E).

**APPENDIX A TO PART 179—TABLES OF
THE MUNITIONS RESPONSE SITE
PRIORITIZATION PROTOCOL**

The tables in this Appendix are solely for use in implementing 32 CFR part 179.